



2626
17

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
	:	Examiner: Mark E. Wallerson
STEPHANIE ANN SUZUKI, et al.)	
	:	Group Art Unit: 2626
Application No.: 09/661,183)	
	:	
Filed: September 13, 2000)	
	:	
For: RULE-BASED DATA)	
REPRODUCTION SYSTEM	:	
AND METHOD)	February 28, 2005

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE

Sir:

This supplements the Amendment dated December 20, 2004, and further responds to the Office Action dated September 20, 2004.

The applied art, namely Tan, is not seen to teach each and every one of the above-identified features, particularly as regards processing a rule set to determine whether to reproduce reproduction data based on whether the reproduction data satisfies selection criteria of the rule set.

As submitted in the December 20, 2004 Amendment, Tan is seen to describe a system for load-balancing print jobs among the networked printers. More

particularly, Tan is seen to describe using both logical printers, which the user selects to generate the print output, and physical printers, which are then selected to perform the actual print output based on a known capacity of the printer and the current number of jobs assigned to the physical printer. (See Tan, Abstract, Figure 5, and col. 7, commencing at line 20) Tan is seen to describe an attribute database 600 which stores printer attributes for use in load balancing. Referring to col. 5, commencing at line 31, Tan's printer attributes are seen to define printer characteristics such as printer speed and resolution, as well as current load information and maximum load information. However, the printer attributes described in Tan are not seen to determine whether to perform a print, but rather are merely seen to be used to determine which physical printer is to perform the print. That is, Tan is seen select printers for the purpose of load balancing and is not seen to use selection criteria to determine whether or not to reproduce reproduction data.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 12, 23, 33 and 40 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The other claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to
our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Carole A. Quinn", written over a horizontal line.

Carole A. Quinn
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 90614v1